

FILED BY *[Signature]* D.C.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
WESTERN DIVISION

05 MAY 19 AM 6:50

ROBERT G. DI TROlio  
CLERK, U.S. DIST. CT.  
W.D. OF TN, MEMPHIS

THE CLARK CONSTRUCTION GROUP, )  
INC., )  
Plaintiff, )  
v. ) No. 01-2780 Ma/A  
CITY OF MEMPHIS and THE )  
MEMPHIS COOK CONVENTION )  
CENTER COMMISSION, )  
Defendants and Third- )  
Party Plaintiffs, )  
v. )  
WILLIAMSON, HAIZLIP, POUNDERS )  
& PICKERING, )  
Third-Party Defendant. )

---

ORDER AFFIRMING MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S DECISION IMPOSING SANCTIONS  
FOR DOCUMENT DESTRUCTION

---

Before the court is the Defendants' objection to the magistrate judge's order imposing sanctions on them, filed March 25, 2005. Plaintiff responded to the motion on April 12, 2005. For the following reasons, the magistrate judge's order is AFFIRMED.

This court may reject a magistrate judge's decision about a nondispositive matter only if that decision is "clearly erroneous or contrary to law." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a). See Massey v. City of Ferndale, 7 F.3d 506, 509 (6th Cir.

252

1993). A decision is clearly erroneous when the court "is left with the definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed." United States v. United States Gypsum Co., 333 U.S. 364, 395 (1948). "[T]he clearly erroneous standard only requires the reviewing court to determine if there is any evidence to support the magistrate judge's finding and that the finding was reasonable." Tri-Star Airlines, Inc. v. Willis Careen Corp. of Los Angeles, 75 F. Supp. 2d 835, 839 (W.D. Tenn. 1999) (citing Heights Community Congress v. Hilltop Realty, Inc., 774 F.2d 135, 140 (6th Cir. 1985)).

Magistrate Judge Anderson found the Defendants in violation of a prior court order specifically enjoining them from destroying any documents relevant to the Cook Convention Center expansion project. He found that the Defendants were "grossly negligent" in destroying the documents and granted Plaintiff a "rebuttable adverse inference establishing that the City had documents within its possession which most likely would have been relevant to this case; however, the City failed to preserve these documents, and the documents were destroyed." The Defendants argue that the adverse-inference sanction was legal error because their spoliation of evidence was not intentional, but only grossly negligent.

"The rules that apply to the spoiling of evidence and the range of appropriate sanctions are defined by state law." Beck v. Haik, 377 F.3d 624, 641 (6th Cir. 2004). In Tennessee, "[t]rial courts have wide discretion to determine the appropriate sanction

to be imposed" for discovery abuse. Mercer v. Vanderbilt University, Inc., 134 S.W.3d 121, 133 (Tenn. 2004). "The doctrine of spoliation permits a court to draw a negative inference against a party that has intentionally, and for an improper purpose, destroyed, mutilated, lost, altered, or concealed evidence." Bronson v. Umphries, 138 S.W.3d 844, 854 (Tenn. Ct. App. 2003). The magistrate judge noted that the Defendants' conduct appeared to fall short of the Bronson standard but found that "trial judges have the authority to take such action as is necessary to prevent discovery abuse." Mercer, 134 S.W.3d at 133.

The Defendants' argument about the content of Tennessee law ignores the nature of their wrongful conduct. The sanction was imposed on them not only in response to the spoliation of evidence but also for the violation of a standing federal court order. A trial court's discretion to impose sanctions for violations of its discovery orders is broad, and the magistrate judge's decision is well within the accepted range of penalties. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(b) (2); Phillips v. Cohen, 400 F.3d 388, 401-02 (6th Cir. 2005). Thus, the Defendants have not shown that the magistrate judge's order was clearly erroneous or contrary to law.

For the foregoing reasons, the magistrate judge's order imposing sanctions for document destruction is AFFIRMED.

So ORDERED this 18th day of May 2005.



---

SAMUEL H. MAYS, JR.  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE



## Notice of Distribution

This notice confirms a copy of the document docketed as number 252 in case 2:01-CV-02780 was distributed by fax, mail, or direct printing on May 19, 2005 to the parties listed.

---

Christopher M. Caputo  
LESS GETZ & LIPMAN  
100 Peabody Place  
Ste. 1000  
Memphis, TN 38103

Albert C. Harvey  
THOMASON HENDRIX HARVEY JOHNSON & MITCHELL  
40 S. Main St.  
Ste. 2900  
Memphis, TN 38103--552

Joseph T. Getz  
LESS GETZ & LIPMAN  
100 Peabody Place  
Ste. 1000  
Memphis, TN 38103

Jeffrey R. Gans  
THELEN REID & PRIEST LLP  
701 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.  
Ste. 800  
Washington, DC 20004

Taylor Cates  
BURCH PORTER & JOHNSON  
130 N. Court Avenue  
Memphis, TN 38103

Ricky E. Wilkins  
LAW OFFICE OF RICKY E. WILKINS  
119 S. Main St.  
Ste. 700  
Memphis, TN 38103

Daniel Warren Van Horn  
ARMSTRONG ALLEN, PLLC  
80 Monroe Avenue  
Ste. 700  
Memphis, TN 38103--246

John W. Ralls  
THELEN REID & PRIEST  
101 Second Street  
18th Fl.  
San Francisco, CA 94105

Lucian T. Pera  
ARMSTRONG ALLEN, PLLC  
80 Monroe Avenue  
Ste. 700  
Memphis, TN 38103--246

James R. Newland  
THELEN REID & PRIEST  
Market Square  
Ste. 800  
701 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.  
Washington, DC 20004

Michael I. Less  
LESS GETZ & LIPMAN  
100 Peabody Place  
Ste. 1000  
Memphis, TN 38103

Timothy R. Johnson  
BASS BERRY & SIMS PLC- Memphis  
100 Peabody Place  
Ste. 900  
Memphis, TN 38103

William M. Jeter  
LAW OFFICE OF WILLIAM JETER  
35 Union Ave.  
Ste. 300  
Memphis, TN 38103

Michael Evan Jaffe  
THELEN REID & PRIEST LLP  
701 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.  
Ste. 800  
Washington, DC 20004

Honorable Samuel Mays  
US DISTRICT COURT